

June 10

sales would put the automaker at the mercy of the Wall Street bankers, as Henry Ford used to call them.

The new automotive year is well on the way to another near record, perhaps an all-time record. With the population growth and the two-car family trend, it could become a habit and spell the end of automotive off years.

But the auto industry needs room to breathe to do its job with its widely acknowledged know-how. May the reported words of a White House official "Thank God for the auto industry"—become part of the permanent Washington language and not just a cry of salvation in a year of misery and mischief.

ROBERT B. POWERS,
Publisher.

Administration Indecision Strengthens Castro

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 10, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the Communist threat to the Western Hemisphere grows and is strengthened each day that the Castro dictatorship stays in power in Cuba supported by the armed might of the Soviet Union. The indecision of the Kennedy administration in either bringing about the removal of Russian troops and weapons and in taking steps to give the Cuban people a chance to regain their freedom adds to the strength of the Castro government and further threatens the security of the United States.

It is past time for President Kennedy to take firm and bold action to rid Cuba of Castro and the Western Hemisphere of Russian aggression. He should immediately reinstate the Monroe Doctrine, stop the shipment of strategic materials to Cuba, including oil, and demand the immediate withdrawal of all Russian troops and arms.

The following column by Virginia Prewett in the June 7 issue of the Washington Daily News exposes the problem created by the President's lack of policy:

ACTION NOW IS URGED TO OUST CASTRO
(By Virginia Prewett)

A capsule referendum of U.S. nongovernmental leadership has urged President Kennedy to publicize the full facts of the United States-Cuba position, and to remove both Fidel Castro and the Soviet presence from Cuba "without delays."

New York's Freedom House and other specialists recently disclosed that 25 seasoned U.S. military, inter-American agreed that—

Washington's withholding of information on Cuba "hinders the formation of American public opinion rather than obstructing the enemy." The meeting demanded publication of "the correspondence between Nikita Khrushchev and the President during and following the October confrontation."

On eliminating the Soviet occupation of Cuba, "what is needed is a commitment to urgent and immediate action, unambiguously expressed."

On the risk of nuclear war, "We are most in danger when our indecision suggests fear,

weakness, or ineptness. The risks later will be more formidable than the risks now."

SPARK

Continued Red presence, in fact, "could provide the very spark that ignites a nuclear war," the report notes. "Any incident—a barroom brawl with Soviet soldiers in Havana, a flareup of tempers over a child run down by a Soviet jeep—could lead to Russian shooting."

Among those at the 3-day assembly, cosponsored by Freedom House and the Citizens' Committee for a Free Cuba, were Vision Magazine Publisher William E. Barlow, the Research Institute of America's Leo Cherne, Herald-Tribune Columnist Roscoe Drummond, the liberal Inter-American Association for Democracy and Freedom's Frances Grant, Daniel James of the Citizens' Committee, Brig. Gen. S. L. A. Marshall, Columnist Edgar Ansel Mower, Columbia University Prof. Frank Tannenbaum, Vice Adm. Charles Wellborn, Jr., Florida University's Prof. A. Curtis Wilgus, and this writer.

The report asks: Is our policy geared to secret "accords" with Khrushchev? Why is there no tough ban on American goods to traders with Cuba? Did Bay of Pigs prisoner exchanges serve as cover for a Tito-style reconciliation with Castro? Don't "deals" with a Sovietized Cuba repudiate United States-Rio Pact obligations and "in effect the whole inter-American system?"

ACTION

The conference listed 14 possible direct Castro-toppling actions, from collective measures honoring the Rio and Bogotá Pacts and Punta del Este to invasion of Cuba by an OAS joint task force.

"Our leaders must keep us informed of the facts and their plans for the future; we must keep our leaders informed of the people's judgment and willingness to sacrifice," the conferees agreed.

United States-Yugoslavia Trade Relations—Senseless or Sensible?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RONALD BROOKS CAMERON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 28, 1963

Mr. CAMERON. Mr. Speaker, during recent weeks a number of articles opposing most-favored-nation tariff treatment to Poland and Yugoslavia have been inserted into the Record by various Members.

This subject is a controversial one and properly so. But I am sure that most of my colleagues are eager to examine both sides of the coin before reaching a final decision on this important trade matter. It is to aid them in formulating an objective judgment on the most-favored-nation issue that I call their attention to an article which appeared May 19, 1963, in the conservative-oriented Los Angeles Times.

The story was written by Mr. Jack Jones, an assistant city editor of the Times, who recently toured Yugoslavia on a visit to Europe.

The article follows:

YUGOSLAVIA GUESSING GAME—WHICH WAY WILL TITO TURN?

(By Jack Jones)

BELGRADE.—Raise a glass of slivowitz with a Yugoslav at a sidewalk cafe along the

Bulevar Revolucije and, because you are an American, he will ask:

"Why does your Congress try to kill trade relations with Yugoslavia? Are they trying to force us to trade with the Russians?"

Confusion and hurt persist as to why the United States, for which a large number of Yugoslavs hold warm regard, should want to revoke this country's most-favored-nation tariff benefit status.

Combined with the conclusion that Western European buyers for about half of its products will fade with the acceleration of the Common Market, Yugoslavia's fear over possible U.S. trade discrimination is a chilling one indeed.

American economic observers here see two alternatives:

Yugoslavia will turn fulltilt back to the Soviet bloc, from which it broke in 1948, in the ideological uproar with Stalin.

Marshal Tito (who after all is Yugoslavia) will try the monstrous task of putting together an independent trade bloc of non-aligned nations.

These observers regard the second possibility as hopeless.

The recent visit to Belgrade of Secretary of State Dean Rusk made clear the Kennedy administration's concern over where Yugoslavia might wander if Congress doesn't repeal the act which would cancel the most-favored-nation clause.

Because they have heard that Rusk was "optimistic" in his private talk with Tito, many Yugoslavs will tell you now they don't think the United States is going to let them fall in with the Soviets again.

U.S. Embassy people in Belgrade are almost frantic in their desire to convince the American public—and Congress—that Yugoslavia is unique among Communist countries, that it is inaccurate to identify it with Moscow leadership.

They are openly disturbed by the threat of discriminatory tariffs, just as the Common Market specter is growing.

"The overall effect of the congressional action," said one American diplomatic figure here, "was to give the impression that Yugoslavia's future with the West isn't very bright * * * that their trade future lies in areas other than Western Europe and North America."

But even Yugoslavia's staunchest American friends here recognize that Tito and some of his underlings are directly responsible for anti-Yugoslav feeling in the United States through their penchants for pro-Soviet statements.

American resentment is natural, they realize, when one considers that Yugoslav economy has been bolstered by more than \$2 billion in U.S. aid over the past few years.

But, Embassy people here point out, that aid is finished except for surplus wheat sales and the windup of some technical assistance programs.

And that aid, they maintain, helped keep Yugoslavia out of the Soviet bloc and make it a stable nation in what historically has been a short-fused region.

Yugoslav trade officials feel Americans don't realize that 75 percent of the country's post-1948 trade has been outside the Soviet bloc—almost half of it in Western Europe and about \$30 million of it yearly with the United States.

The U.S. figure may drop to \$20 million or less if most-favored-nation status is killed.

Any indication that Tito can forge a non-aligned trade bloc which would flourish without Russia or the West draws doubtful headshakings because of the lack of heavy machinery in virtually all those countries.

Tito apparently sees his (or Yugoslavia's) future as leader of the Afro-Asian bloc, the nonaligned, however, and there is a great deal of feeling here that he will chase that rainbow despite his ingrained Marxism which prompts him from time to time to babble Soviet-style recitations.

1963

sight, as it has been in dealing with the cotton problem, is to invite disaster. We cannot improve the world's economy by weakening our own.

Clarke School for Deaf

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 1963

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, Clarke School for the Deaf, in Northampton, Mass., was chartered June 1, 1867, by an act of the Massachusetts General Court. Its early history is sprinkled with great and generous names and the area of Northampton where the school is located—Round Hill—is rich in the history of this country.

In 1871, Alexander Graham Bell taught the Clarke faculty his father's system of visible speech. Later, he was to marry Mabel Hubbard, who had been deafened at the age of 4.

One of the great unfolding dramas of the time was the eventual partnership between Alexander Graham Bell and "May" Hubbard Bell.

A recent article in the Northampton Daily Hampshire Gazette vividly recaptures this memorable event. I commend the article of May 28, 1963, to my colleagues:

CLARKE SCHOOL FOR DEAF CARRYING ON VITAL WORK

Mabel Hubbard, wife and inspiration to Alexander Graham Bell, early in life learned the meaning of the 23d Psalm.

Four-year-old May Hubbard walked through the valley of the shadow of death when she suffered a virulent attack of scarlet fever. The disease destroyed her hearing.

Coaxed by her mother, the bewildered little girl identified objects and even volunteered a few words. But she could not hear. May tore at her parents' hearts when she said perplexedly, "Why don't the birdies sing? Why don't you talk to me?"

RECITES PSALM

The Hubbards never were sure that May understood them. They feared that the illness had affected her brain. Then one day as Mrs. Hubbard was reading the 23d Psalm to May, the winsome girl joined in as her mother read, "And goodness and mercy shall follow me." May did understand.

In her book, "Make a Joyful Sound," Helen E. Waite describes the steps—first faltering, then confident—that May took from the baffling world of silence and her subsequent life with the inventor of the telephone.

Mabel Hubbard was the daughter of Gardiner Green Hubbard, a Boston lawyer and philanthropist who was the first president of the National Geographic Society. Mr. Hubbard was determined that his daughter should not spend her life in silence and isolation.

Mr. Hubbard sought teachers who could help his daughter retain her speech. It was a pioneering quest in 1862, and experts offered him no encouragement. "You cannot retain her speech, Mr. Hubbard," they said. "She will be dumb in 3 months because she cannot hear. And if by some chance she did learn to produce words, her voice would be worse than the screech of a steam locomotive."

Unsatisfied, Mr. Hubbard turned to Samuel Howe, director of the Perkins Institution for the Blind. Dr. Howe, with Horace Mann, had written a classic report about the German schools where deaf children spoke and understood others by reading lips.

Dr. Howe said May could do the same. "Talk, talk, talk to her, just as you do to your other children," he advised. "Make sure she is watching your lips. And teach her by vibration. Have her feel your throat, the cat's purr, the piano, and make her talk."

TRYING TIMES

The task was not easy. Neither of May's parents cared later to speak of those difficult months. Mr. Hubbard once said, "At first our little girl was very unwilling to talk," and Mrs. Hubbard wrote to a friend, "What an easy life you lead. How free from care compared to mine."

"But then, gradually, the tide had turned," Miss Waite writes. "Miraculously, May understood more and more of what was being said to her. She used words and even sentences more freely and voluntarily, even adding to her vocabulary words she hasn't known before her illness . . . She was a happy and responsive member of the family once more."

Mary True, a devoted teacher, then took over May's education, drawing her firmly into the hearing world. "She was my teacher for 3 years," Mrs. Bell later recalled, "and my friend for all time."

In 1867, when she was 9 years old, May Hubbard proved she had learned her lessons well. She was the star witness at a State legislative hearing.

A special committee of the Massachusetts Legislature was considering a proposal for a new school for the deaf. Witnesses doubted that deaf children could be taught to speak and read lips, and a strong faction wanted sign language taught at the new school.

The sign language advocates were carrying the day until Mr. Hubbard called on his daughter to speak to the members of the committee.

"They plied her with questions in history and geography, and gave her simple problems in arithmetic," Miss Waite writes. "May's answers were prompt, while her whole face lit with eagerness."

"Opening a book, May read a page or two easily and clearly. Something like awe seemed to drop over the room. Most of the committee had sudden difficulties with their spectacles. . . ."

The legislature granted a charter for Clarke School for the Deaf—still carrying on its vital work at Northampton. Another bill provided for teaching deaf children at Clarke and other schools how to speak and lipread. The victory was complete.

When she was 13, Mabel Hubbard visited Germany with her mother. Even the directors of the advanced German schools for the deaf were amazed. "I tell you no German child in any oral school can match her in any way—speech or speech reading, or everyday knowledge," one director said. "It is a true miracle."

When Mabel was 15, her mother took her to Alexander Graham Bell to improve her speech still further. Young Bell was teaching visible speech, invented by his father, Alexander Melville Bell. It was a system of graphic symbols representing the position of speech organs in making different sounds.

Professor and pupil fell in love. Mabel married Bell in 1877 when she was 19, a year after he had successfully demonstrated his telephone at the Centennial Exposition in Philadelphia.

Though a great inventor, Dr. Bell always considered himself a teacher of the deaf. Until their deaths, he and Mrs. Bell together labored to help fulfill the Biblical prophecy that the "ears of the deaf shall be unstopped . . . and the tongue of the dumb shall sing."

So Goes the Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1963

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, as the House will soon consider the Tax Rate Extension Act of 1963 to extend again the discriminatory excise tax against the automobile, I take this opportunity to call the attention of my colleagues to the following editorial from the 1963 Automotive Yearbook, setting forth so effectively the importance of the automobile industry to our whole economy and the danger of serious repercussions if the industry does not continue to prosper.

The excise taxes designed to retard production during wartime have been lifted from almost every product on which they were levied, but not on the automobile. Now, when the President is calling on us to consider tax reduction as a force to stimulate the Nation's economy, I submit that it is certainly a time for deep reflection about the advisability of continuing these unfair excises.

The author of this editorial is Robert B. Powers, publisher of Ward's Automotive Reports, a well-known weekly digest covering all phases of automotive production. As we ponder about the various courses of action to promote economic growth, I feel that we should join in saying "Thank God for the auto industry." The editorial follows:

SO GOES THE ECONOMY

The automotive year of 1962 will be recorded as the year Washington discovered the old Detroit adage: "As the auto industry goes, so goes the economy."

Certainly the industry that produced over 8 million cars and trucks gained little encouragement from a Government seemingly more interested in hearings and investigations than in helping to create a favorable business climate.

In the year past, the attitude toward business was puzzling, unemployment kept mounting, the Nation's gold supply kept dwindling, a scarcity of silver bullion became evident and the props were pulled out from under a seesaw security market.

Yet the auto industry and all those dependent on it continued to thrive. The car-makers had attractive products and knew how to merchandise them to an increasingly selective public.

And Chrysler, as the star performer of the year, sharply increased its share of the automotive market and helped to stir a sluggish security market to life.

There is an omen in all this that should not be ignored. It is that a profitable and full-employment automotive year needs now to be close to a 8 million car and truck year, continually mounting costs demand it.

The break-even point among automakers gets yearly higher. It's the same for the parts makers, the dealers, the suppliers.

It took \$1.06 billion in sales in 1962 for one automaker to turn in a net profit of \$34 million on the year's output.

A manufacturer in another field netted \$140 million on an identical volume of business. He could suffer a \$100 million loss in sales and still net more than the car manufacturer. A similar \$100 million drop in

1963

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A3721

Assembly of Captive European Nations Deplores Approval of Hungarian Credentials in United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 10, 1963

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the recent approval of credentials of the Communist delegation of Hungary to the U.N. and the role in this approval that was played by the U.S. delegation is subject to critical comment throughout the country.

One of the organizations which rightfully, forcibly, and morally discusses this development—the Assembly of Captive European Nations—includes in its membership the legitimate leaders of the Hungarian people, and I ask leave to insert the statement of ACEN into the Record at this point:

ASSEMBLY OF CAPTIVE EUROPEAN NATIONS DEPLORES APPROVAL OF HUNGARIAN CREDENTIALS IN UNITED NATIONS

Regarding the unopposed decision the United Nations Credentials Committee took on June 5 to accept the credentials of the Kadar-delegation to the U.N. General Assembly, the Assembly of Captive European Nations issued today the following statement:

The approval of the credentials of the Kadar regime by the United Nations Credentials Committee will come as a great shock to the people of Hungary and other captive countries. The absence of any attempt to challenge the legitimacy of the representatives appointed by a regime the U.N. had branded as one established by Soviet military intervention will, we feel, be viewed as proof that to all practical purposes the question of Hungary has been dropped, as proof that sheer expediency and not principle determines the policies of the Western powers. The abstention of the U.S. delegation will be credibly represented to the captive peoples by Communist propaganda as evidence that the status quo in East Central Europe has come to be accepted as final. It will further demoralize the captive peoples and thus weaken an essential deterrent to Soviet aggressive-ness in Europe.

The damage this action is bound to cause to the prestige and the vital interest of the Western powers can still be repaired, at least in part. The United States and other free nations can bring up the substance of the matter at the autumn session of the United Nations General Assembly. They can and should ask for the inscription of the real issue on the agenda of the next U.N. session. And the real issue is not whether some amelioration has occurred in Hungary, but whether the right of self-determination has or has not been restored to its people. The U.N. resolutions have called indeed for the restoration of political independence of Hungary by means of the withdrawal of Soviet troops, reestablishment of human rights and free elections. These are demands the passage of time cannot render obsolete. It is the hope of the Assembly of Captive European Nations that public opinion in the United States and other free nations will lend strong support to the plea that the real issue be raised as a matter of principle, regardless of the chances of securing a majority vote.

Cuba, Training School for Subversion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 10, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, while the Kennedy administration urges further understanding of the Russians and prepares for new concessions in the spirit of accommodation, the Soviet Union, through its puppet Castro, continues to use Cuba as a training school for subversion in the Western Hemisphere designed to isolate and destroy the United States. Wouldn't it be a good idea, before the President makes any further accommodation to tell Khrushchev to get his troops and weapons out of Cuba, stop sending his saboteurs into other Latin American countries and pull his agents out of the United States? Or is it too much to ask the Russians to at least call a halt to their campaign against us while the peace talks are going on?

The following report from the Chicago Tribune of June 9 tells to what extent the Soviet Union is using Cuba to export subversion and make U.S. policies look ridiculous:

REPORT FROM LATIN AMERICA: CALLS CUBA SCHOOL FOR ATTACK ON AMERICAS (By Jules Dubois)

LIMA, PERU, June 8.—Pedro G. Beltran, former Prime Minister, recently delivered an address to the Catholic Press Association of the United States and Canada in Miami Beach.

"Cuba has thus become a model campus of the modern college for subversion of the Americas," he said. "The Communists are mounting an attack on our countries from within."

No sooner had he returned home than a band of Communists who had been trained in Cuba fought a battle with police at an isolated river port in Peru.

Beltran, who has been exposing the Communist conspiracy in his newspaper La Prensa here, points out that his remarks in Miami Beach fit the facts so well that they now sound as if they had been prepared after the event.

"How can you expect to control this sort of indoctrination and infiltration?" Beltran asks with great concern. "The boys who are taken to Cuba—whether from Peru, Bolivia, Colombia, and Ecuador or any of these countries—need no passport in order to travel. Once they are over the border, Castro agents furnish them with money and transportation. They are welcomed to Havana without documents and when they leave they are provided with forged passports which do not mention their stay in Cuba. Certainly they will not return home through regular channels.

ACTIVITY BLAMED ON RUSSIANS IN CUBA

"The fact is," Beltran warns, "that as long as the Russians are in Cuba, it will continue to be, as I said in Miami, a model campus of the modern college for subversion of the Americas."

Beltran recalls that a distinguished Englishman reminded him recently that it took Europe centuries to halt the Moslem penetration and finally to drive them back from Europe. In South America, he points

out, the Russian threat is seen in a different light.

"We see Cuba as an ideal center of operations for the subversion of Latin America," he says, "far handier and more effective in Khrushchev's plan for this part of the world than mother Russia. Russia is too far away. A different language is spoken there."

Premier Fidel Castro learned that during his trip to Russia, where he was rewarded by Khrushchev for having fallen in line as the Voice of Soviet Russia in Latin America. He was made a hero of the Soviet Union, another Communist accolade to add to the Lenin Peace Prize that he previously received. This time, though, Khrushchev personally pinned the medal on him at a Moscow ceremony.

While Beltran rightfully expresses his concern about the Communist encroachment, one must also ask what the Peruvian Government plans to do about it.

OAS CALLED ONLY AS GOOD AS MEMBERS

As yet there has been no sign that it might place the case before the Organization of American States. Critics of the OAS lash at that body and accuse it of inaction. But the OAS is no better than its member governments and it cannot act without being requested to do so by a government.

In this particular case, Peru is the affected party. Peru has collected the evidence and has in custody the fighters who confessed they were trained in Cuba.

Perhaps the military junta that is supervising tomorrow's presidential elections may feel that it is only an interim government and that the constitutional regime (if one should assume office July 28) is the one to pursue the matter before the OAS.

In the meantime, though, the junta has been warned through the exposés of La Prensa, which began more than a year ago, that guerrillas were active in the Andean mountains and were part of a plot to seize the government and deliver the country to Russia.

Beltran is now sparking another campaign; a law against Communist subversion. The junta might enact that before it leaves office, if it does leave as scheduled.

Cotton Problem—Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. RALPH F. BEERMANN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 10, 1963

Mr. BEERMANN. Mr. Speaker, the future of the food and fiber industry from the producer to the consumer, is in a very delicately balanced, precarious position. Congress can and should write legislation during the 1st session of the 88th Congress that will gradually move our country forward toward the day when our commodities will enjoy a free market regulated by the greatest law—supply and consumption.

The cotton problem is clearly illustrated in the following article in the June 1963 issue of the Reader's Digest:

COSTLY CHAOS IN COTTON—TIME TO END IT: ILL-CONCEIVED GOVERNMENT INTERFERENCE IS WREAKING HAVOC IN AN INDUSTRY THAT WAS FORMERLY ONE OF THE LEADING U.S. DOLLAR EARNERS ABROAD

(By Robert S. Strother)

With the very best of intentions, the U.S. Government is bringing ruin to the American cotton growing and cotton textile indus-

A3722

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

June 10

tries—and losing nearly a half billion dollars a year in the process.

Only a dozen years ago cotton was among the most valuable of all our exports. Our cotton growers supplied 47 percent of the cotton fiber in world trade, and our mills 558 billion square yards of cotton piece goods. Today our growers supply only 33 percent of the cotton fiber traded, and our mills only 417 billion square yards of cotton piece goods. In the last decade 3,711,000 cotton system spindles have been shut down, and 282,000 textile mill jobs—15 percent of the total—have disappeared.

In the last decade, too, our imports of cotton textiles have multiplied tenfold. In 1960, for the first time since recordkeeping began, imports exceeded exports, and they are still rising. As every customer of a U.S. department store or supermarket can see, our display counters are loaded with blankets, lace curtain, tablecloths, underwear, shirts, dressing gowns—cotton textiles in almost every form known—bought abroad and offered here at low prices.

On top of this, we have 8,500,000 bales of surplus cotton—\$1.7 billion worth—in storage, in spite of the fact that we spent approximately 392 million tax dollars last year alone in efforts to dump, barter or, in effect, give the fiber away.

In short, cotton growers and processors are losing markets rapidly, both to foreign-grown cotton and to man-made fibers, and they will go on losing them until we have no cotton growers and mills left, or until our ill-conceived farm and trade policies are radically revised.

The trouble in cotton began in the 1930's. At that time, the United States supplied nearly half of the world's requirements, selling an average of 8,300,000 500-pound bales of cotton overseas annually, at a profit. Then, to help the small, depression-ridden farmer survive, the U.S. Government started propping up the price of cotton with public money, as it has done with wheat, corn, soybeans, and other farm commodities. This kept poor marginal farmers in business. But it also raised U.S. cotton prices so high that our cotton began to lose buyers in the world market.

After World War II, tropical nations around the globe saw a chance to profit by undercutting the U.S. high price for raw cotton. In addition, American point 4 advisers in countries such as India, Pakistan, Egypt, Sudan, Mexico, and Brazil helped local growers with improved seed, machinery, and instruction in advanced methods of cultivation. Production abroad soon soared to record heights, and the world price of cotton fell. U.S. cotton, with its price pegged at around 35.5 cents, could not compete. By 1956 we were selling only 2,200,000 bales abroad, instead of the 8,300,000 we had been selling 20 years earlier. Our stockpiled surplus rose to 14,500,000 bales.

Something had to be done.

Congress might have cut the subsidy being paid to cotton farmers, thus letting the price of U.S. cotton fall to a competitive level. The growers of about 85 percent of our cotton could have withstood this and been healthier for it, because it would have preserved their market, and because they do not need a subsidy to compete with growers anywhere anyway. But the small, inefficient growers of the remaining 15 percent would have been squeezed out, some into other crops, some into other businesses. So, instead of cutting the subsidy, Congress piled a new subsidy on top of the old one, setting in motion a scheme which became notorious as "two-price cotton."

This new scheme directed the Secretary of Agriculture to subsidize the sale of cotton abroad to any extent required to get rid of it. That meant, in effect, that he would buy up the surplus of U.S. cotton at the pegged price of, say, 33.5 cents a pound,

and then dump it somewhere overseas at, say, 25.8 cents. He was empowered to take the difference out of the U.S. taxpayer.

At the same time, U.S. cotton mills were obliged to buy domestic cotton at the pegged price because there is a virtual embargo on raw-cotton imports. Thus, adoption of the two-price system meant that U.S. mill owners had to pay \$187 a bale for the same cotton that the United States was glad to sell to a foreign mill for \$129.

Spokesmen for the U.S. textile industry bitterly denounced two-price cotton as unfair Government discrimination against U.S. mills—and predicted a flood of textile imports. Their forecast was quickly confirmed. As the import tide rose month by month, many U.S. plants closed down, and others went on reduced workweeks. For the people who gained their living in the U.S. textile business, there was irony in the swirling tide of imports; their own income-tax payments had helped financed it.

Meanwhile, the United States had embarked on a second course which hastened the wrecking started by the two-price scheme. In a humanitarian move to provide cheap textile to clothe the ragged masses of Asia and the Middle East, U.S. foreign-aid administrators built a number of new textile plants abroad and modernized others. The new mills were equipped with the most advanced machinery. American engineers, designers, and merchandising men with vaunted know-how were sent abroad to help.

These plants, too, moved in on the American market. With wage rates as low as one-fourth to one-tenth of those enforced by law in U.S. mills, with U.S. cotton available at a discount (and even in some cases bought with U.S. aid funds), and with efficient new plants financed in part by the American people, how could they lose?

Thus, the ruin of the cotton-growing industry was spread to the cotton-textile industry. Hundreds of thousands of Americans lost their jobs.

There have been periodic—and inept—attempts to doctor the situation. U.S. textile exporters could not stay in business under a 25-percent handicap in raw-material costs; so an equalization fee was introduced. Under it, exporters may recover, again from the U.S. Treasury, 8.5 cents a pound for the cotton content of the goods they sell abroad.

Most of the new would-be remedies were designed, however, to regulate the flow of imports. These, too, have proved fruitless. Japan, which buys large quantities of U.S. cotton (1,103,000 bales, or 39 percent of her requirements, in 1961-62), adopted a voluntary quota on her shipments of cotton textiles to the United States. But then Hong Kong rushed to supply what Japan relinquished, followed by the Republic of Korea, Taiwan, Pakistan, India, the Philippines, Portugal, Spain, Italy, and France.

Seeing little progress in resolving cotton's dilemma, some administration spokesmen seem inclined to wash their hands of the mess that the Government has done so much to create. The Washington Post said outright what Under Secretary of State George Ball seems to have hinted: perhaps the U.S. textile industry should consider itself a "terminal case," and arrange to expire quietly while the Government undertakes to train its remaining 891,000 workers for other, unspecified, jobs. "Sustained protection of uneconomic mills," the newspaper said, "would close our markets to struggling nations in whose advancement we have invested millions in foreign aid."

Textile people flare at the idea that the welfare of struggling nations should be of more concern to the U.S. Government than that of the 2 million Americans engaged in the domestic textile and garment industries. They attack the idea that their industry is obsolete. "Foreign producers

are not underselling us because they produce a prettier, more serviceable, or more durable product," says Robert C. Jackson, executive vice president of the American Textile Manufacturers Institute, "but solely because they have access to cotton—including American cotton—at one-third less than we must pay, and because they pay a wage that could not be tolerated in this country."

"I recognize that foreign-trade policy is an integral part of overall foreign policy," Robert T. Stevens, president of the J. P. Stevens Co. mills has said. "Textiles, however, have been called upon to carry too much of the load—unless our Government desires to consider the textile industry expendable."

What lies ahead for this sick industry? With President Kennedy's approval, the Department of Agriculture proposed in November 1961 that an equalization fee of 8.5 cents a pound be levied on the cotton content of textile imports, thus exactly offsetting the export subsidy. "A tariff to offset a subsidy that compensates for a price support," snorted the New York Times.

Fortunately the Tariff Commission rejected the proposal, and the President tossed the problem back to the Department of Agriculture for referral to Congress, where one of the new ideas is to let handlers other than the producers buy U.S. cotton at the 32.5-cent support price, sell it to U.S. mills at the 24-cent world price, and then collect the difference of hundreds of millions of dollars annually from the ever-loving U.S. Treasury. The favored remedy, in short, is still another huge subsidy—an attempt, in the words of the Baltimore Sun, to "balance by new interference the unbalance wrought by earlier interference in previous efforts to balance still earlier interference."

We don't need any more remedies of this sort. We need, basically, to get rid of the subsidy paid to U.S. cotton growers, so that the price of our cotton can move toward the free-market level. This can be done gradually, over several crop seasons, and it must be done. The Committee for Economic Development and the American Farm Bureau Federation agree on this. The growers of 85 percent of U.S. cotton are by a wide margin the most efficient producers in the world, and can compete globally without leaning on a subsidy. It makes no sense to kill off both them and the cotton textile industry in an attempt to keep the growers of the remaining 15 percent down on the farm.

"The little cotton farmer is fighting a losing battle, and knows it," a Department of Agriculture official in Georgia said to me recently. "The Government, instead of trying to keep these guys in business, ought to be helping them to get out and into something useful. It ought to give those who want it training and transition loans. A plan like that could save us a lot of money in the long run. It could also save the industry."

World consumption of cotton is increasing steadily. Despite its present troubles, U.S. cotton at the right price has a tremendous opportunity to recapture and expand its markets. It was U.S. research that doubled the cotton yield per acre in 30 years, and that opened vast new markets by developing cotton textiles that resist wrinkling, scorching, and mildew. Still greater discoveries may lie just ahead, but only if price supports, reduced gradually over several seasons, are used as a temporary bridge to carry the entire industry to solid economic ground, and no longer as a barrier to change.

The people of the United States, in the hope of promoting prosperity and peace, have assumed enormous burdens, both economic and military, around the globe. Our commitments have been based on confidence in the Nation's unprecedented economic strength. To allow that strength to be undermined by carelessness or lack of fore-

A3718

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

June 10

When I hear about the concern of passing debts on to the next generation, my reaction is that the worst possible debt we could pass on the next generation is a boy or girl who is untrained and who is going to cost the next generation a \$1,000 or more a year. That is the debt we can't pass on. The thing that we can't get across, apparently, is that a good many of the things we do as a Government are the kind of things companies do as companies; they invest in the future. And the investment cost should not be charged against our present concept of expenditures.

If we could get across the idea that when we train a person, put \$1,000 into the education of a person, it is an investment for the future. When we build a park, when we build a highway, when we build a school, when we build a hospital, those things are investments for the future and shouldn't be charged against the present. It's not just a matter of deficit spending. It's a drawing of the distinction between immediate out-of-pocket costs and the investment thing. I agree, in principle, with what is suggested. I think it would be better if it were put in terms which got away from the idea of deficit spending. That's an oversimplification.

Mr. SMITH. We asked Secretary Wirtz, will we get full employment back.

Secretary WIRTZ. That's a question the American public will have to answer. My answer to it is that we can get it down there. It takes the decision to do the things we want to do. But I'm talking, not—I'm talking hard business sense. If we do set out to do these things, if we develop a tax program, a manpower program and do these things we want to do, I think it can be moved down past the 4 percent, 3 percent, toward the 2 percent which is probably the ultimate limit because there are always people moving from one job to another and there are always a few who can't be employed. I think it is a practical target to shoot for 3 percent and a 2 percent.

Mr. SMITH. Some friendly advice from British politician Callaghan.

Mr. CALLAGHAN. I think yours is a tough problem. I think you have got to educate. Could I make one general plea: that we shouldn't, any of us, allow ourselves to become the prisoners of words and of old-fashioned ideas no matter what they are. The real test is how are we going to make human beings live and fulfill all their values and all of the qualities of which they are capable? And we ought, if we find our ideas are destroying human beings and their right to survive, then we ought to be willing to put those ideas on one side.

Mr. SMITH. We have nothing to add that will improve on that. Good night.

Bokaro Steel Decision**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 10, 1963

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Cleveland Plain Dealer of June 1, 1963:

BOKARO STEEL DECISION

The stage is being set for a clash between President Kennedy and Congress over the biggest foreign aid project we have ever undertaken. It is a proposal that the United

States should spend \$891 million of the taxpayers' money to finance the construction of a government-owned steel mill at Bokaro, India, 150 miles northwest of Calcutta.

President Kennedy is on record as favoring the project. At his May 8 press conference he noted that India needs steel and added: "I would think we could assist if it meets what the economy of India requires. I think we ought to do it."

There is opposition to the project in Congress, in part because of district of Prime Minister Nehru's neutralist policies, his seizure of Portuguese Goa by force and his refusal to agree to a plebiscite to determine the future of Kashmir.

The opposition has been reinforced by the report of the foreign aid investigating committee headed by Gen. Lucius Clay. That committee said the United States "should not aid a foreign government in projects establishing government owned industrial and commercial enterprises which compete with private endeavors." The committee reasoned that the way to get development is to keep government out, that otherwise the fear of political pressures and price and tax restrictions would discourage investment by private enterprise.

India already has five steel mills, three owned by the government and two privately owned. The three government-owned plants were built with foreign aid help, one by West Germany, one by Soviet Russia and one by Britain. But all five do not produce enough steel to meet India's needs.

For several years Congress has been spoiling for a fight over foreign aid. The Bokaro project could touch it off in the form of an amendment to the foreign aid bill specifically barring the Bokaro proposal, or prohibiting aid for government enterprises which compete with privately owned business.

U.N. Secretary Peddles Communist View to American Students**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 10, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, for those apologists for the pro-Communist official statements of the U.N., I refer them to the following editorial appraisal of a commencement address by the Secretary General, U Thant, to the graduating class of Mount Holyoke College. How far will the American people permit an organization based on our soil, largely financed by our taxpayers to go on giving lipservice to the cause of our enemies?

U THANT AGAIN

The Secretary General of the United Nations, U Thant, used the occasion of a commencement address at Mount Holyoke College to unload another of his patented apologies for communism. To hear him tell it, communism is a friendly and innocent system, content to live and let live, and the world environment is poisoned by unjust suspicions of its aims.

Mr. Thant did not have the effrontery to name the principal culprit as the United States, but that was most certainly the thought in his mind. It was, he said, a "psychological or emotional frame of mind" that produces wars.

"This state of mind, fed daily by mass media propagating sensationalism and suspicion," he said, "develops into a condition

bordering on obsession, which renders peaceful settlement of disputes difficult if not impossible."

As Mr. Thant derives his large tax-free income by residing among us, it may be taken that this is his characterization of American media. It is not within his mental compass that all media in Communist countries are harnessed to the propaganda purposes of the state and give vent to a constant stream of vilification against those standing in the way of a Communist takeover.

Nor are the rocket rattling speeches of Khrushchev or the usual threatening orations of Red military leaders on such occasions as May day exactly in harmony with the Thant thesis that hostility and hatred are preached only in the West.

"History," said the Secretary General, "is full of examples of religious intolerance, but the ideological fanaticism that we see today seems to me sometimes to be even more implacable, and certainly more deadly and dangerous to the human race, than the religious fanaticism which marked the history of past centuries."

This might be taken as an adequate characterization of communism, but if you think that Thant meant it to be so, you will be obliged to guess again. For the Secretary General's remarks must be read in the context of an incredible speech which he delivered December 2, 1962, at John Hopkins University.

In that appearance he described the amelioration of communism from Stalin to Khrushchev, describing Khrushchev as committed to the thesis "not of the inevitability of war, but of the imperative of competitive coexistence." Thant embellished this appraisal with the suggestion that we settle such contrived controversies as that relating to Berlin by a process of give and take with the Communists.

As Prof. Hans J. Morgenthau of the University of Chicago has remarked, "How do you bargain with a nation which believes in the universal triumph of communism and regards itself as charged with the mission of bringing about your doom? What can you give a nation by way of compromise if that nation is bent on taking all?"

At Mount Holyoke, Thant wound up with the vision of a neutralist world governed by a world authority developing through the U.N. out of the needs of its largest and most powerful constituent members. This is fantasy, for how can the United States and the Soviet Union ever make common cause when their spirit and motives are irreconcilable?

Cuban Subversion in Canada**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 5, 1963

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, for many months now, the world has been awakened to the tremendous degree of communist subversives who, trained in Cuba, are spreading destruction throughout this hemisphere. The most recent nation to feel the sting of Castro's marauders is Canada—a nation that continues to do business with Communist Cuba.

The recent bombings in Quebec, the subject of an excellent Miami Herald editorial of June 4, 1963, and which I insert in the RECORD following my brief remarks, should further awaken nations

1963

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A3717

Mr. SMITH. Now, why is it that we did so well from the war up to 1957 and relatively much less since 1957?

Secretary WIRTZ. Well, when you say so well that the economy is moving along right now at a good rate in terms of gross national product and so on and so forth. But something that people forget is that the impact of automation on the economy came during those fifties, when the work force growth was low because of the war and the postponed effect from it. Now we are getting the confluence of both automation and the increase in the economy, so even though the economy as a whole is doing well in terms of full employment, we are not doing well.

Mr. SMITH. How many jobs do we have to create each year?

Secretary WIRTZ. We have to create for the next 4 or 5 years a million and a half new jobs each year to take care of new people coming into the work force. It's growing that fast. In addition to that, we have to create jobs to replace every job which a machine takes away. Now, that's a hard figure to arrive at, but it's running right now between 25,000 and 30,000 a week. And in addition to that, we have got to create jobs which will bring our present unemployment down from—oh, about 5½ percent to the figure 4, 3, 2, hopefully. The combination to these means the answer to your question. Something in the neighborhood of 2 million jobs a year for the next 4 or 5 years. It's a big order.

Mr. SMITH. Now you have been quoted as saying that even though we don't have enough jobs to go around, the amount of work to be done in this Nation is tremendous and that we could use all the people we have if we would use them sensibly. What about that?

Secretary WIRTZ. If we would set out to do the things we want to do in this country—some things in the private sector: pulling up the low incomes to the level they ought to be; some things in the public schools we ought to meet; the hospitals; get rid of the slums; we could have a manpower shortage in this country very easily. If we set out to do the things we can do, want to do, and a good many of them we will do. That's where the answer will come.

Mr. SMITH. The problem of getting enough purchasing power to the people to stimulate industry to employ more people is crucial. In America in the depression thirties, unemployment remained high because with all the Government spending, not enough was spent.

In America after World War II the situation was the opposite. War put a stored up purchasing power equal to a hundred and fifty billion dollars in Americans' pockets, and they spent it. Also, rising expenditures of the Marshall plan and the cold war injected more purchasing power. The result was a period of full employment.

The year 1957 is the year the postwar boom is considered to have ended. Surplus purchasing power was used up. Defense spending continued to rise but it went no longer into industries turning out masses of weapons and employing millions of workers; it went into new weapons requiring fewer high-paid workers. Also, to reduce rising labor costs, industries automated at a furious rate, reducing the need for manpower. And now the postwar baby crop is coming of age, demanding more jobs faster.

To illustrate the problem: this is a schematic oversimplified design of how the economy works:

One, the consumer buys goods;

Two, the store then orders more goods from the factory; and

Three, the factory invests in increasing its plant in order to make more goods this employs more workers and puts money into hands of consumers.

But now, the new plant is automated and employs fewer people, distributing less money. Flow of dollars, once swift, from consumer to store, now slows down too.

The store orders less from the factory.

The plant cuts down on its production, causing unemployment.

The debate about what we should do involves dissension about where we should restimulate the flow. Robert Heilbroner thinks the flow should be stimulated at the investment point:

Mr. HEILBRONER. Today if you had to put your finger on the buyer in the economy who is not so much the consumer, it is business. Business buys for capital expansion. Business is buying new plants, new buildings, new machinery. That's the sector which is, in a sense buoyant enough, but disappointing. It could be higher.

Mr. BUTLER. The problem in our economy for 6 or 7 years has not been a lag in Government spending. Government spending has been going up 6 percent for a year on the average. The lag has been in business investment in new plants and equipment. The investment that provides new and better machinery and thus supports the creation of new jobs. Such investment if not increased in this 7-year period has been steady. Our problem is to provide the incentives, the encouragement to increase investment in new plants and equipment and thus achieve real and lasting prosperity.

Mr. SMITH. Economist Leon Keyserling disagrees. He thinks the stimulus should be aimed directly into the pockets of consumers.

Mr. KEYSERLING. The reason business isn't investing still more is that they do not foresee enough more demand for their products to invest even more rapidly than they are in the building of plants and equipment. Therefore, the whole concentration of stimulatory policy, in my view, should be on the expansion of consumption, demand for other products. That takes two forms: consumption among 180-odd million American people, privately, and consumption by Government—public spending—of the things that a nation needs and can't get privately.

Senator DOUGLAS. I would say that the remedy is to raise purchasing power to the level of prices. This does mean an increase in the national debt, because it would be effected either by cutting taxes without commensurately cutting expenditures or choking off private demand through curtailing credit, or by a public works program. In either case what you do is put an injection of monetary purchasing power into the economy to build up total demand.

Mr. SMITH. The President's plan is aimed to please both those who want him to stimulate investors, and those who want him to stimulate the consumers. His plan is a tax cut and a tax reform that will give both investors and consumers more money to spend. Like many plans aimed to please everybody, it may please none.

We asked the investor's man, William Butler, if the President's plan will solve our problems:

Mr. BUTLER. No; I do not believe it will. It seems to me that the President's tax program is spread out over too long a period—3 years or longer in the case of the corporate tax—and this dilutes its impact so that it will not do the necessary job.

Mr. SMITH. Keyserling, who prefers to stimulate the consumer:

Mr. KEYSERLING. I don't think the tax program itself will do very much to help this problem. First, because it is too small. Second, because I think it isn't distributed in a way that will maximize its effectiveness. And third, because I think many other things besides taxation are even more important than tax reduction to deal with this unemployment problem.

Mr. SMITH. We have never hesitated taking stands on this program and won't hesitate now. I think Mr. Keyserling is right. The economy is sluggish and doesn't provide enough employment for people because about one-fifth of Americans live in poverty and haven't enough purchasing power to give the economy the stimulation it needs. The logical thing to do would be not to have a feeble tax cut to benefit well-off people who don't need it. The logical thing would be more Government spending to get money to the bottom one-fifth of Americans, spending on their sadly neglected education, on replacing their slums with decent neighborhoods, and so on.

However, even the President's rather weak tax cut is getting nowhere in Congress. What is it that impedes action to cure what the President has called our No. 1 domestic problem—unemployment?

The tendency of unemployment to rise amid our great wealth can only be halted and reversed by vigorous action, especially by Government spending which will no doubt increase our deficit. There is a deep-rooted and wrong American prejudice against Government spending and deficits. Almost every modern American President has deferred to that prejudice with calamitous results.

In the early thirties, President Hoover thought that restricted Government spending would bring prosperity just around the corner. In fact, it deepened depression.

It is easy to forget that Franklin D. Roosevelt's winning campaign in 1932 was that he would balance the budget and restrict Government expenditure. He became famous for doing the opposite, but not enough to end the depression.

In the 1952 campaign, Eisenhower promised one thing—to balance the budget. In office he failed to do that 5 years out of 8, and created the biggest peacetime deficit in our history, but in trying to obey the myth preceded over a series of recessions.

Kennedy's key campaign promise was to get the economy moving. He has not notably succeeded, and that is greatly due to not facing the need for much more Government expenditure.

British Politician James Callaghan offers an apt comment on deficit spending.

Mr. CALLAGHAN. We show a deficit you know. But by altering the way which we made up our accounts we could show a profit if we wanted to. And we do confuse, I think, capital items with revenue items. Where's the profit when you put in a sewage scheme or when you build a school? There isn't any but it shows a deficit. And yet these are capital items which are going to yield a return, although not a direct financial return.

We are altering our system of accounts in Britain because we want to make this more clear. We've been held up to the world as running very heavy deficits. By altering the accounts we needn't alter our policy. We will just look better. This is absurd you know, really, and I do think we've got to be very careful not to become the prisoners of words on this question of deficit financing.

Mr. SMITH. Secretary of Labor Willard Wirtz.

Secretary WIRTZ. I think in connection with these programs we propose the Manpower Development Training Program, a better education program, a youth employment act, that kind of thing, we are told that the cost is such that we can't afford it. I wish I could somehow get across the idea that it would cost us today—does cost today—just in round figures about a thousand dollars to retrain a man, to salvage a boy or girl who would otherwise go into the slag heap, about a thousand dollars. That boy or girl will represent a cost to this economy of this country of about a thousand dollars a year if we don't train him or her.

The economics somehow get out of joint.

dealing with Castro to the insanity of their position. Trading opens the door to subversives. It makes their dirty work child's play.

Any nation doubting Castro's aims in this hemisphere should examine closely the Canadian episode. It offers the clearest proof possible that when trading with Castro, the bonus is subversion and sabotage.

The Miami Herald editorial herein referred to follows:

A CUBAN EXPORT—TO CANADA

One sentence stands out in a dispatch from Montreal reporting that police arrested eight suspects in the recent wave of bombings in Quebec:

"They said the leader was trained in Cuba."

A later account called him "a 33-year-old Belgian trained in terror tactics in Communist Cuba."

The others were said to be mostly between 19 and 22 years old. One was described as a mechanic who fabricated the bombs.

In making the arrests, police confiscated 50 sticks of dynamite, detonator caps, fuses, timing devices, and wires.

These details are meaningful. So is the gang's method of operating, even to its name, the Quebec Liberation Front (FLQ). The stated purpose of the FLQ was to force the secession of French-speaking Quebec from the other Canadian provinces.

The announced aim played on the long-standing desire of French Canadians for a larger voice in their nation's affairs. Any other grievance would have served as well. But the real aim of such terrorists always is the same—to foment hatred, strife, and disorders.

The FLQ boasted of its crimes. One of its bomb victims was a 65-year-old night watchman. Another was an army sergeant barely alive after losing his left hand and suffering severe brain damage while trying to defuse a bomb planted in a residential mailbox.

The gang also claimed credit for blowing up a section of railway track in the path of Canada's Prime Minister, and for a \$35,000 army payroll robbery in which a soldier was shot six times by a masked bandit carrying a submachinegun.

If all this sounds familiar, it is. The liberators of Quebec were following the same pattern as their counterparts in Venezuela and elsewhere in Latin America. The difference is that good police work in Canada, by peace officers and soldiers, put the suspects behind bars and "broke the back" of the gang, in the words of a police official.

The formula is the kind that comes straight from Communist training camps in occupied Cuba: Send one trained terrorist anywhere in the Western Hemisphere. Give him an appropriate arsenal, or money to acquire it. Let him use any handy local issue to recruit young hotheads. Launch the reign of terror.

The sequel in Canada should be as instructive as the opening chapters. South of the border Americans will ask again: How long do we tolerate the three "C's" in our hemispheric alphabet: Castro's Communist Cuba?

Touch Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. GOODELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 10, 1963

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, every Member of the House should have an

opportunity to read James Reston's column that appeared in the New York Times for Sunday, June 9, 1963. Mr. Reston is not a partisan critic of the President. He speaks of President Kennedy from a sympathetic and knowledgeable base.

I particularly call attention to this paragraph by Mr. Reston:

The President's appeal, somehow, is to the mind of the Nation and not to its heart. He defines the problems of race, unemployment and education, but doesn't come to grips with them. He is a tactician but not a teacher. He plays touch government: he seems to touch everything and tackle nothing.

Under unanimous consent I include the entire column at this point:

TOUCH GOVERNMENT

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, June 8.—Almost every political crisis in the Nation is a time of opportunity as well as danger, and this is particularly true of the current racial crisis.

The country has been startled by the conflict in the streets. It is now paying attention. The opportunity, therefore, has come for leadership at every level—National, State, and local—to break through the barriers of prejudice and indifference and sweep away the intolerable injustices to the American Negro.

Here the leadership of the President is critical. He cannot do it alone. He needs the help of the Congress, the Governors, and the public and private leaders of every community, North and South. But the job of creating a working majority of the people for change, of bringing the feelings of the fairminded majority of the Nation to bear on public legislation, is undoubtedly his.

THE LEADERSHIP PROBLEM

There is something wrong with his leadership on the homefront. Something is missing in his speeches, his press conferences, his trips, and his timing. He is not communicating his convictions effectively, and it is important to try to analyze why.

The President's appeal, somehow, is to the mind of the Nation and not to its heart. He defines the problems of race, unemployment, and education, but doesn't come to grips with them. He is a tactician but not a teacher. He plays touch government: He seems to touch everything and tackle nothing.

There is something too cool about it all. He gives the country statistics about the Negro—17 percent Negro unemployed in Chicago and only 5 percent white, etc.—but he doesn't convey the humiliation or the ache in the heart.

This is a just and decent country. It may be confused about taxes and missiles, trade and budgets, Federal and local power, but on human questions like the right of a Negro to buy a sandwich at a drugstore counter or a spend a night without embarrassment at a hotel, the vast majority is obviously for equality.

President Kennedy has never seemed to believe much in appealing to the spirit of the whole Nation. He thinks in blocs. He concentrates on institutions, on the leaders of associations, and on the representatives of the people rather than on the people themselves.

He is, in short, political rather than philosophical, more given to manipulation than education. But the fact remains that manipulation has not succeeded. The people like him but do not quite believe in him enough to support him openly. The Congress admires his political skill but does not follow his policies.

DIFFUSING THE IMPACT

His trip into the West this weekend illustrates the point. The main thing on his mind when he left here was the racial crisis, in which he needs the support of the majority of the people and of the Republican Party. But he did not speak in a single forum where he could be heard by the whole Nation, and he did not concentrate on the race issue, but mixed it up with military policy and a Democratic fundraising political rally in Los Angeles.

The result of this is not to inspire disinterested concentration on the central race question, or direct the attention of the whole Nation to the race problem, but to disperse an enormous amount of personal energy over local audiences and different subjects, including the raising of funds to defeat Republicans whose support he desperately needs in Congress if he is to get any civil rights legislation at all.

The surprising thing about this is that the President knows how to concentrate on a single subject and focus the attention of the whole Nation on it. He has done so in the past on the Berlin crisis and the Cuban crisis. The national television audience is available to him almost any time he requests it. He can present his civil rights program to a joint session of Congress, and again arrest the attention of the whole Nation. All will listen if he carries his civil rights battle into the South or the racial jungles of northern cities. But he has done none of these things.

Something, then, is obviously wrong. When the Chinese write the word "crisis," they do so in two characters, one of which means "danger" and the other "opportunity." But the opportunity in the present racial danger is not being exploited and part of the reason is that the leadership is well meaning, but ineffective.

Reviewing Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 10, 1963

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, very soon the House will consider the foreign aid authorization bill, subject at this time to recent review by the Clay Committee.

The Philadelphia Bulletin on June 5, editorially commented on the need for review of foreign aid. I insert this timely editorial into the RECORD at this time:

REVIEWING FOREIGN AID

Sixteen years ago today, on June 5, 1947, General Marshall, then Secretary of State, delivered the commencement address at Harvard. It must have been the most influential speech ever given at a graduation exercise, for in it he launched the idea of foreign aid.

The war was over, and war measures like lend-lease had ended with the coming of peace. What Marshall now proposed was something new. Let the nations of Europe, laid waste by the conflict, agree on a European recovery program, and the United States would be prepared to finance it. The offer extended to the Communist nations (who quickly spurned it) and to former enemies like Germany and Italy, as well as to faithful allies.

Now, after 16 years, Europe no longer needs assistance, except for our participation in NATO, a strictly defense operation. But, in

the meanwhile, the idea of foreign aid has been extended to cover (1) nations directly threatened by Communist aggression; (2) nations ostensibly undecided between East and West, who get help in the hope that it will keep them out of Moscow's orbit; (3) new nations struggling to get on their feet; (4) underdeveloped nations all over the world.

Congress is now reviewing foreign aid, and many close observers have said bluntly that we must reduce substantially the budget requests of the administration. It is undeniable that serious errors and miscalculations have marred the program's record. Some could not be avoided, but others grew out of theories that have failed to prove themselves. For example, 16 years of experimental foreign aid has not shown that a Tito, a Gomulka, or any other Communist can be converted by making his path smooth for oppression.

Nor can we congratulate ourselves on the career of a hostile neutralist like Sukarno. Perhaps the effort to win him over was worth a try. But now that the money is running out in this country, and we are faced with the necessity of establishing priorities, if something must go, experiments which have failed should be among the first programs to be terminated.

Another field under scrutiny is the advisability of financing adventures in public ownership, like a steel mill for India, just to show our good will.

There are critical areas in the world—one right at our doorstep, in the Caribbean—which can use foreign aid money expended in our own self-interest. There are others where actual fighting is going on, and where our interests are vitally engaged. After they have been taken care of, allocations for other purposes should be examined with cool objectivity. The fact is, that our continued loss of gold and hard foreign exchange has created an emergency which cannot be separated from the outgo of foreign aid money and goods from this country. The United States can no longer afford the pleasant role of rich uncle to all the world.

Education Dragging

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 10, 1963

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, on June 5, Commissioner of Education Francis Keppel delivered one of the finest statements on the problems of American education that I have ever seen. Delivering the commencement address at my alma mater, Boston University, Commissioner Keppel pointed out the need for constant attention to the improvement of the quality of our teachers and our educational product, as well as the quality of our classrooms and instructors. The significance of the search for quality and excellence can never be overemphasized.

Under unanimous consent I insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the article by John Chaffee, Jr., which appeared in the Boston Herald on June 6 discussing Commissioner Keppel's address:

"EDUCATION DRAGGING," WARNS KEPPEL: 2,482 AWARDED BOSTON UNIVERSITY DEGREES

(By John Chaffee, Jr.)

The Nation lacks a much-needed sense of urgency regarding the adequacy and quality

of its schooling, U.S. Education Commissioner Francis Keppel said yesterday at Boston University's first outdoor commencement.

Only 8 months after assuming the task of directing the Nation's education effort, Keppel said he has found in Washington only vague agreement that something ought to be done about improving the quality of schooling in America.

WAITED TOO LONG

Federal aid to education must be raised from a "desirable domestic goal to a deadly serious necessity," the former dean of the Harvard Graduate School of Education told a crowd of nearly 20,000 at Boston University field.

"A basic question is not whether our schools and colleges are better than those of the past—they are—but whether they are good enough for the future—they are not," Keppel said.

"Knowledge and technology are moving so rapidly that only progressively faster and better learning can succeed in keeping individuals a jump ahead of ignorance," Keppel warned.

"Much of what was true yesterday is already obsolete or old fashioned today; and much that seems important today must be reevaluated tomorrow."

The commissioner then told 2,482 degree candidates that they were already partly obsolete.

"We have waited too long," he insisted. "We are face to face with a problem that must be solved at once or our national future will be in jeopardy."

"We cannot be satisfied with yesterday's brand of education for tomorrow's world."

LARGEST IN TWELVE YEARS

Keppel was one of 10 honorary degree recipients at exercises for Boston University's largest graduating class in 12 years.

Director Sargent Shriver and the Peace Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 10, 1963

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, many words of praise have been heaped upon the Peace Corps since its inception 2½ years ago. They have come from world leaders and some of the original critics of the Peace Corps within this country. In every instance of praise, bouquets are also tossed to Peace Corps Director Sargent Shriver for his faith, vigor, and persistence in organizing what many said could not be organized, training the young people who did want to serve humanity selflessly, and winning worldwide acclaim for the United States and the idealism of Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I think that my colleagues will be interested in a recent article by the noted columnist, Holmes Alexander, printed in the Boston Herald on May 29, 1963, concerning the Peace Corps and Director Shriver.

The article follows:

WHAT HAPPENS NEXT?—IS PEACE CORPS MERELY SHRIVER?

(By Holmes Alexander)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—It's fair to say for Sargent Shriver, Director of the Peace Corps,

that he now carries the undeserved handicap of being a Kennedy in-law.

Any other Frontiersman who had proved his administrative ability as Shriver has in a minor post would have been promoted long before now. But the Cabinet is closed to him because a Kennedy is already there. The governorship of Illinois is presently blocked by local political complications. Shriver seems likely to keep his present post until after next year's elections.

Meanwhile, imitation being the sincerest form of flattery, Shriver is being internationally complimented in a manner that no administration figure can boast. Eight nations are in the process, or on the verge, of forming volunteer oversea agencies on the American Peace Corps model. West Germany has appropriated \$1.4 million for the purpose, and is expected to hold some sort of inaugural ceremony when President Kennedy, accompanied by Shriver, visits there next month. Denmark, the Netherlands, Norway, and New Zealand have made starts. Italy, Switzerland, and Belgium are discussing ways and means with Shriver. Honduras, El Salvador, and Jamaica are instituting domestic versions of the Corps. Argentina plans to send Spanish teachers to the United States in a gesture of reciprocity.

Shriver has showed rare signs of administrative talent. He recovered from a very rocky start when the Corps got some bad publicity at the outset. Although his outfit is growing faster than Congress and other critics would like (he is aiming for an enlistment of 13,000 by September 1964), Shriver has done the truly remarkable thing of cutting the administrative spending ratio. He began by spending 33 cents to the dollar on headquarters money, and now has it down to 19 cents. It costs \$7,000 to keep a volunteer corpsman in the field and only \$2,000 to keep an administrator behind him. By bureaucratic standards, these are economical operations.

But Shriver may have outgrown his job. He also may have made things very tough for his successor. Now that the novelty of the Peace Corps has worn off, it bears the burden of proving its worth. The first year's appropriation was \$30 million, the second was \$59 million, the present year's asking price is \$108 million. Congress has already refused to underwrite \$150,000, which Shriver asked to pay the first-year expenses of founding an international secretariat. The danger of overzealousness, which always besets do-gooder organizations, is beginning to show. The next Peace Corps Director will have to trim ship.

That will be the time, with Shriver gone and his fledgling out of the nest, to ask if this idealistic effort is worth pursuing. The test, I think, will not come on the elevated but unprovable thesis that the Peace Corps is, in William James' famous concept, a "moral equivalent of war." This kind of down-to-earth, secular missionary work does not remove the international causes of conflict for the plain reason that people do not make war. Their politicians do that for them. The causes of war are so complex that not even the greatest historians have ever devised a credible explanation for mankind's organizational pugnacity.

But the Peace Corps idea will prove its worth, if at all, on a much lower scale. It has already demonstrated the usefulness of what is known in Shriver shoptalk as "middle-level manpower." The scientist and the economist at the top, and the common laborer at the bottom, are not the full answer to community development at home or abroad.

Something else is needed. Call it the missing link. And if may be that Peace Corps idea of personal instructorship is it.

1963

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

9939

to the attention of our people. But I have for your consideration today what I consider one of the most glaring lapses of good thinking that has crossed my desk for some time. It concerns an instance where the Area Redevelopment Administration has entered the sugarbeet growing business in a area of the country where there is no history to substantiate the growing of such a crop. And I gather that if ARA and the Department of Agriculture have their way, a substantial amount of our new domestic beet quota may go to that area instead of to areas across the country that already have ideal soil for the growing of beets.

On March 6 of this year, the Area Redevelopment Administration announced that a \$25,000 technical assistance study had been granted to determine the economic and engineering feasibility of establishing a sugarbeet refinery in Cayuga County, N.Y. This study was granted because Cayuga County had been designated as eligible to participate in the area redevelopment program due to substantial and persistent unemployment.

On March 20, also this year, ARA tells us that a \$93,000 technical assistance study of the feasibility of growing and processing sugarbeets in Cayuga County, N.Y., has been approved. That is a total of \$118,000 just to find out whether or not sugarbeets can be grown in an area that ARA has admitted is hilly and rocky. There is even some doubt as to whether harvesting machinery can function properly.

They are growing sugarbeets on a test area covering 250 acres of Cayuga County at at this very moment, and a news release circulated in that area states that ARA is supplying the contracting farmers with the necessary seed, is furnishing them with the proper planting and harvesting machinery, and will end up by purchasing the crops from them at prevailing market rates.

The same release informs us that the Agriculture Department is reserving a special 50,000-ton sugarbeet allocation for Cayuga County and that ARA is scheduled to underwrite some 65 percent of the cost of the \$20 million project. That release says further that the refinery, if finally approved, could not become fully operational until 1966, but that the Department of Agriculture intends to ask Congress to amend last year's law so that, if the tests prove successful, the project can get underway immediately.

Apparently Cayuga County would already have the allocation if it were not for one little technicality: Nobody knows yet whether or not the farmers there can raise sugarbeets on questionable soil. But ARA seems to be taking care of that little detail this summer with taxpayer-financed studies.

The point I want to make is that we have dozens of areas across the Nation, with some of the most suitable soils known for the raising of sugarbeets, who have been literally begging for acreage allotments. These areas, too, such as in my own native Red River Valley, have been declared ARA eligible because of persistent unemployment. The Cayuga project, then, is just another attempt to solve a problem in one area while creating new problems for other areas of the country. This is an outright attempt to ignore the known beet growing areas of the country for an unknown quantity in the dubious name of area redevelopment.

The great Red River Valley of Minnesota and the Dakotas, for instance, are not asking for ARA-financed studies. They are not asking for anything except permission to grow beets on some of the richest and most productive soil in the world. But this Government does not hear them, because we are so busy spending public funds on make-work projects that may never be feasible.

Mr. Speaker, such projects just do not make economic sense, nor do they alleviate the human suffering for which they are intended. The Federal Government simply pours thousands of dollars into areas that then compete directly with worthwhile, organized local effort elsewhere. The sorry part of this mess is that farmers in known sugarbeet areas are being hurt because of efforts to solve problems elsewhere, problems our farmers had no part in creating.

It is time we called a halt to make-work projects that do nothing except waste our money in one section of the country and create new problems elsewhere.

SPECIAL ORDER

Mr. BROMWELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, at the close of business and following all other special orders previously granted, I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I object.

UNITED STATES CONCERNED AT RISE IN CUBA SHIP SAILINGS

(Mr. CRAMER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and to include an article.)

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I listened with great interest to the President's speech before the graduating class of American University. If that class was not afraid to meet the challenges of the sixties before the President's address, they must be scared to death now; for the President, reciting the latest New Frontier line, successfully expounded a

fear of war psychosis which, if past performance is any indication, is intended to pave the way for further concessions to the Soviets.

The President stated that the people of the United States should reexamine their attitude toward Russia. What does this mean?

Are the American people, after re-examining, to decide that atheistic communism is not so bad? That the Soviet enslavement of millions of people behind the Iron Curtain is all right? That the brutality and slaughter of freedom-seeking people in Hungary should be regarded as a childish prank? That the brick wall separating families and loved ones in Berlin, in spite of treaties to the contrary, is merely an expression of Soviet architecture? Are we to overlook every treaty the Russians have broken which is, in effect, every treaty they have ever made?

I think the answers to these questions are meant to be "yes" if one places any credibility in the President's almost unbelievable statement that the antognotic, saber-rattling utterances that come from Russia are not really indicative of the thinking of Khrushchev and the Soviets, but of his propagandists.

According to the President, freedom-loving countries can get along with the Soviet system of dictatorship and enslavement if we take the time and effort to increase our understanding of it, if we improve our communications with them.

This statement of New Frontier foreign policy is frightening, and the peddling of the scare of war philosophy by the Kennedy administration makes further concessions to the Russians in order to get along with them inevitable.

This sounds reminiscent, but in far more covert terms, of it is better to be Red than dead. The American people do not regard these as the only alternatives. They choose to be alive and free, and this can only be accomplished with a strong and determined foreign policy that is not frightened to death of and seeking accommodations with an enemy that has promised to bury us, has promised that our grandchildren will grow up under communism.

This basic expression of New Frontier philosophy is being applied to this hemisphere today, particularly with regard to Cuba. I have been stating for many months that the New Frontier is trying to work out some compromise, some accommodation looking toward a coexistence with communism in Cuba policy. Today the President confirmed my suspicions by expounding the ADA philosophy in foreign affairs.

Perhaps this explains why so little concern has been shown over the 50-percent increase in Russian shipping, including armaments, to Cuba since the quarantine, the continuing and now increased shipping by non-Communist countries to Cuba, Britain, and Canada

in particular, and the accommodations between Cuba and even some of the Latin American nations that still recognize and do business with Cuba.

According to official figures of the Maritime Administration, during the first 4 months of this year, 113 known trips by 92 non-Soviet-bloc ships went to Cuba through May 31 of this year. There were 36 trips in April alone, and 16 of these were British. As a matter of fact, 33 of the 92 trips were British ships, 13 of which were tankers carrying precious oil for Castro's war machine.

Twenty-three of the ninety-two ships were under Greek registry.

In addition to the increased shipping by non-Communist-bloc nations, apparently with no effort to prevent it by the New Frontier, I am sure, a further accommodation to Castro and the Kremlin was the reported cessation of low-level surveillance flights over Cuba and the decreasing numbers of high-level surveillance flights.

This accommodation philosophy is further evidenced by the FAA order of 3 weeks ago which permits Cuban commercial planes to overfly the United States enroute from Canada so long as they stop for inspection. This latter condition, incidentally, gives Castro's Communist government use of and access to our airports in the major cities of the Northeast, including Dulles International Airport outside of Washington, D.C.

In exchange for this accommodation, Cuba has apparently agreed not to hijack or shoot at our commercial planes if they cross Cuba and this quid pro quo was accepted by the United States only last week when the prohibition against U.S. commercial flights over Cuba was withdrawn.

Thus, the mood is to be one of accommodation as spelled out by the President today unless the New Frontier awakens to the fact that it is not the mood of the American people. America demands firm leadership in ridding this hemisphere of Communism in Cuba and elsewhere as well.

The only reexamination of our attitude toward Russia should be one looking toward a firmer position, not toward how we can give in without losing too much face to the Communist demands as the price for coexistence.

All these concessions are supposed to be made in the name of peace, but the basic fallacy of this approach is that the Communists have never kept their agreements. It ignores the proven fact that the international Communist conspiracy has as its stated goal—repeated again and again—to bury capitalism and the United States.

To the Communists, concillation, and concession are signs of weakness. We cannot afford to display weakness on any front or in answer to any challenge hurled at us by the Communists if our freedoms are to be preserved.

SHIPPING TO CUBA SHOWS NEW CAUSE FOR CONCERN

(Mr. ROGERS of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, latest U.S. Government reports show that free world shipping to Cuba is on the increase—enough increase to cause real concern.

During the peak period of June to August 1962, when the Soviets were attempting their crash program military buildup of Cuba, a total of 164 non-Communist ships called in Cuban ports. Since January of this year there have been 89 non-Communist ships calling in Cuba; a figure which represents more than half of last summer's traffic.

What are the Soviets doing in Cuba to require such shipping? What is the reason that free world shipping for this year totals more than it did during the month of July 1962, when such traffic reached its peak? I think these are questions which weigh heavily in the minds of those who recall the events of last October.

I have repeatedly urged that this Government close its ports to ships from allied countries which call in Cuban ports. To date this Government has taken only limited action through a blacklist of such vessels carrying food-for-peace cargoes. Obviously this system has had little effect.

If U.S. ports were closed, as I have suggested, this traffic would come to a screeching halt. No nation would continue its shipping to Cuba if denied access to profitable U.S. cargo runs. Furthermore, such action would discourage the more than 20 allied tankers which have delivered Russian oil to Castro regularly since January, and without oil Castro's island fortress would come to a screeching halt.

Why should our allies shoulder part of the Soviet burden of supplying Castro? Why should we continue to silently approve this practice by allowing these allies access to our ports?

I urge that the United States close its ports immediately to those who value rubles over dollars, and freedom.

THE LATE HONORABLE FRANCIS E. WALTER

(Mr. McCORMACK (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include a letter from the Honorable Howard Beale, Ambassador of Australia, on the life and service of our late and distinguished colleague, the Honorable Francis E. Walter.)

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I include as part of my remarks the following letter from the Honorable Howard Beale, Ambassador of Australia:

EMBASSY OF AUSTRALIA.

Washington, D.C., June 7, 1963.

The Honorable JOHN W. McCORMACK,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: On behalf of the Australian Government, and of myself, I wish to convey to you and to the House, sincere condolences over the great and sad loss you have sustained as a result of the death of Representative Francis E. Walter.

Australia will remember with gratitude Representative Walter's long and fruitful association with the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration which made a most valuable contribution to the solution of the refugee problems following World War II; and to the large movements of population from Europe, which have been of great benefit to Australia's economy and have materially enhanced the role which Australia is able to play as a member of the free world.

Yours sincerely,

HOWARD BEALE,
Ambassador.

POPE JOHN XXIII

(Mr. BOLAND (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, Pope John XXIII is deeply and sincerely mourned probably by more people than man in recorded history. He was admired and loved equally by the great and the little people of the world, because he himself admired and loved, equally, both the great and the little people of the world. Whatever office he might hold, throughout his career, he never looked upon himself as magnified by that office, but used the office as a means of drawing closer to other people, and of helping them as much as possible. His greatness of soul most appeared in his consistent habit of looking upon himself, most sincerely, as insignificant. Thus belittling himself, Pope John was ready to devote his energies to any task, to risk his reputation in any cause, to hazard his health and his life itself in the service of other men.

Out of this greatness came the instinctive rightness of so many sudden, unexpected words and actions. To a delegation of Jewish rabbis he said, in the words of Genesis XLV, 4, "I am Joseph your brother"; to Mrs. John F. Kennedy, after he had been carefully briefed in protocol and in the forms of American etiquette, upon seeing her, he forgot all his briefing, opened his arms wide, and called out "Jacqueline"; to prisoners whom he visited, he recalled the imprisonment of his own relatives; to one who had been his superior officer in the Italian Army, he gleefully identified himself as Sergeant Roncalli. Each step he took, as Pope, from his dealings with the Vatican staff and the people of Rome to his major acts such as the appointment of cardinals and the canonization of saints,

and at the least will certainly do irreparable financial damage to them. As a great American once said—"Let's look at the record."

Electrical World, the management newsletter of the utility industry, on April 8, 1963, stated:

Last year was the best ever for utility net incomes. Based on a sampling of 142 companies representing roughly 95 percent of the total electric revenues from the utility industry, net incomes showed a 10.02 percent net gain over 1961 as compared with a 5.4 percent gain in 1961 over 1960.

It is interesting to note that the four major private power companies in the

Bonneville power marketing area all showed substantial increases in profit. These four major private power companies in Washington and Oregon showed a total increase of \$4,998,000 over their 1961 profits. This represented a gain of 12.3 percent as compared with the 10 percent which the industry averaged nationally. However, the Idaho Power Co. showed a decrease of \$812,000 from their 1961 profits or a loss of 8.4 percent. The following table shows the 1961 and 1962 incomes of the private power companies operating in the BPA area as compared with those of the Idaho Power Co.:

Major private power companies in BPA area

	Net income		Gain	
	1962	1961	Amount	Percent
Pacific Power & Light.....	\$20,842,000	\$18,076,000	\$2,766,000	15.3
Portland General Electric.....	9,025,000	7,880,000	1,145,000	14.5
Puget Sound Power & Light.....	8,589,000	7,746,000	843,000	10.9
Washington Water Power.....	7,063,000	6,819,000	244,000	3.6
Total.....	45,519,000	40,521,000	4,998,000	12.3
Idaho Power Co.....	8,866,000	9,683,000	¹ (812,000)	(8.4)

¹ Loss.

These facts easily answer the question: Is Bonneville Power destroying private power companies? Far from it. Through healthy competition and mutual cooperation with BPA the four major private power companies in Washington and Oregon are thriving and what is more important they have achieved this increase in net income while charging the consumers lower power rates than those charged by the Idaho Power Co. A family using a thousand kilowatt-hours of power would have paid the company that served them the following average monthly bill in 1962:

Power company:	Monthly bill
Portland General Electric.....	\$10.30
Pacific Power & Light (Yakima)....	10.63
Puget Sound Power & Light.....	10.95
Washington Water Power Co. (Spokane).....	12.05
Idaho Power Co.....	14.15

While there has been increase in rates by the four private power companies serving in the BPA area this year and the rates will be the same as 1962 under the rate increase recently granted Idaho Power Co., their 1963 average rate to a family using a thousand kilowatt-hours would be \$15.18.

So the private power companies in the BPA area not only had a 12-percent gain in profits last year as compared with Idaho Power Company's decrease of 8.4 percent but they accomplished this while charging their customers from \$2.10 to \$3.85 per family less each month.

I, for one, am hopeful that Bonneville Power company will have the same effect on private power companies in Idaho that it has had on them in Washington and Oregon—that is higher profits for the power company and its stockholders and lower rates for the power users.

However, this is not going to be accomplished just by wishing it to be so. Dollars spent for full-page newspaper

advertisement attacking BPA are dollars that must be collected from the consumers through higher rates. Power company officials who are spending time traveling the State speaking against BPA are depriving their job of giving the power user the best possible service at the lowest possible cost of their full attention and talents.

I would urge these power company officials to put Idaho ahead of the Idaho Power Co. If they would stop to realize that what is best for Idaho is also best for the Idaho Power Co., then they will take a page from the book of their counterparts in Washington and Oregon who are competing and cooperating with, not attacking BPA. I am convinced that the inclusion of Southern Idaho in the BPA marketing area will then prove to be not only in the best interest of Idaho through a faster growing economy and lower power rates but will also be in the best interest of the Idaho Power Co., through higher profits. That has been the record of BPA—private power company competition and cooperation in Oregon and Washington.

MEMORIAL DAY

(Mr. O'HARA of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks at this point in the Record and that Mr. AVERY and others desiring to do so may extend their remarks immediately following.)

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am extending my remarks to include a Memorial Day address delivered by an American on British soil. It is as eloquent as it is brief. In 221 words, chosen as flowers from a garden, it epitomizes the spirit of patriotism and the sentiment of living remembrance of America's heroic deed.

The occasion was Memorial Day in the British island of Bermuda and the speaker was Col. Bing Morris, affection-

ately remembered by many Members of the Congress as a former manager of the Congressional Hotel in Washington. Colonel Morris is now the manager of the beautiful Carlton Beach Hotel in Bermuda, an American-operated unit of Hotel Corp. of America.

Bing Morris is one of many Americans whose work takes them to foreign soil. This fact does not—and as Colonel Morris points out, should not—deter them from remembering that they are Americans, and from observing those ceremonies that are significant and important to Americans.

Thus, on Memorial Day this year, Bermudians—British subjects—were treated to the stirring sight of a special flag lowering ceremony by and for Americans on that British island. The ceremony was conducted jointly with Bermuda's own American Legion post, and the flag was one that had flown over the Capitol in Washington. I might add, Mr. Speaker, that the flag for this memorable observation of an American holiday on British soil was sent to Bing Morris by his long-time friend, the distinguished gentleman from Kansas [Mr. AVERY].

Bing Morris' Memorial Day address follows:

My friends, when I was a boy, Memorial Day was called Decoration Day and it honored the dead of the War Between the States. There was always a great parade of prancing horses, brass bands, and the legendary 76 trombones. In the town square or on the city hall steps there was the oration by a local political dignitary, who generally referred to the thinning ranks of the boys in Blue and Gray. There are no longer survivors of the Blue and Gray days, and Decoration Day is now Memorial Day. For those of us who are Americans on foreign soil, there are two reasons that make it imperative that we recognize this holiday. One reason is that there is hardly an American anywhere in the world who did not suffer the loss of a loved one or a friend in our last wars. The other reason is that it is not unreasonable to consider that the doctrines of Americanism proudly reside in our hearts wherever in the world we may be, and for whatever reasons take us beyond the borders of the United States. I thank my fellow Americans, our visitors from other nations, and our Bermuda friends for giving us their time and attention, and above all, my thanks to the Bermuda Post of the American Legion for their kind assistance.

[Mr. AVERY addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

TRIBUTE TO MARSHALL WISE, FORMER DIRECTOR OF CUBAN REFUGEE CENTER

(Mr. FASCELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the body of the Record.)

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, a dedicated and able public servant, Marshall Wise, the director of the Cuban Refugee Emergency Center in Miami, Fla., since March 9, 1961, has recently resumed his previous position as Director of the Miami Social Security Office.

On March 7, 1961, he was requested to assume the position of director of the Cuban Refugee Emergency Center with the understanding that it would prob-

ably be a 60- to 90-day assignment. This temporary assignment has stretched into a period of more than 2 years.

As director of the Cuban refugee program, he was faced with the difficult task of organizing a program to handle thousands upon thousands of refugees arriving daily, in many cases without family or friends and with little or no knowledge of the English language. He was called upon to provide them with, among other things, food, housing, clothing, medical care, jobs, job retraining, resettlement opportunities, and education for both the children and the adults.

Never before in the history of our country have refugees from oppression arrived upon our shores in such numbers, and never before have so many thousand refugees congregated in one metropolitan area.

The Greater Miami area, with a population of about 1 million, has had to absorb approximately 200,000 Cuban refugees. No community could withstand the almost immediate impact of a 15 to 20 percent increase in population without skillful leadership and Federal assistance. The situation was worsened by the fact that there already existed in Dade County, Fla., a serious unemployment problem—so much so that the U.S. Department of Labor and the Area Redevelopment Administration had long ago found that there was a sufficient number of unemployed American citizens to qualify Dade County as a class D labor surplus market area.

There existed no precedent upon which one could predicate a sound program. Therefore, to the newly appointed director and his small staff fell the entire burden of establishing a workable refugee program.

The vast majority of the refugees had to be given a basic course in the English language. Headquarters had to be secured for the various phases of the operation. Food distribution centers had to be established. Unaccompanied children had to be placed. Children had to be located in the public and parochial school systems. Problems of overcrowding, language barriers, and educational cost factors had to be overcome. Medical centers had to be established; cooperation with immigration and security activities had to be set up and maintained; proper and adequate housing facilities secured, medical attention for the ill and aged, and a myriad of other services far too numerous to enumerate were necessary.

He had to immediately set up an effective liaison for many agencies of the Federal Government including HEW, Department of Labor, Immigration and Naturalization, Public Health Service, the Office of Education, the State Department, the Justice Department, Central Intelligence Agency, and others. Liaison had to be established with the Florida Department of Public Welfare, with the Dade County Public Health Department, and the Dade County Public School System, local and county governments and with citizens groups. Close cooperation had to be maintained with the University of Miami concerning professional refresher courses.

Close cooperation also was necessary with various chambers of commerce throughout the Nation, with the various trade, professional and civic associations, such as the American Medical Association, the American Dental Association, AFL-CIO, American Bar Association, Kiwanis, Rotary, Lions, Junior chamber of commerce, and others.

Close liaison had to be established with the Catholic Relief Services of the National Catholic Welfare Conference, the Church World Service of the National Council of Churches, the Hebrew Immigrants Aid Society, International Rescue Committee, and the American Red Cross.

Tribute should be paid to the close working relationship which Mr. Wise has established with the Bishop of the Catholic Diocese of Miami which carried a principal share of the burden during the first year of the refugee exodus from Communist Cuba and still continues to bear an overly large part of the cost.

Close liaison had to be maintained with police and juvenile authorities, though credit should be given to the Cuban people for their actions have caused little, if any, problems in this regard. The refugees are worthy of the highest commendation, and with few notable exceptions the entire Cuban refugee group conducted itself peacefully and orderly as its members sought to find their place in a new community.

Many refugee organizations with varied views and objectives formed. It is a tribute to Mr. Wise's direction that he was able to maintain complete harmony at all times in his dealings and associations with these groups.

Through the efforts of Mr. Wise and his staff in cooperation with the various volunteer groups, over 60,000 Cuban refugees have been resettled throughout the United States. The resettlement program has received many favorable endorsements from communities which have accepted refugee families.

A brief description of how the Cuban Refugee Center operates and the complex nature of its administration as well as its broad area of responsibility will vividly demonstrate the very heavy responsibility laid on Marshall Wise's shoulders.

The Cuban Refugee Center, Freedom Tower, 600 Biscayne Boulevard, Miami, Fla., is the focal point for Cuban refugee registration, resettlement and relief activities. It also coordinates the Federal Government's program of aid to Cuban refugees under a broad directive from President John F. Kennedy. The Federal program is supervised by Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Anthony J. Celebrezze.

At work in the center are representatives of voluntary agencies experienced in resettling refugees in homes and jobs in communities across the United States. The national organizations they serve have for many years resettled refugees who have come to the United States from many countries. All these organizations are members of the American Council of Voluntary Agencies. Represented at the center are: Catholic Relief Services, National Catholic Welfare Conference;

Church World Service, Protestant; United HIAS Service, Hebrew Immigrant Aid Society; and International Rescue Committee, nonsectarian.

The U.S. Employment Service, Department of Labor, also represented in the center, promotes job opportunities for qualified employable refugees, provides identification of the work experience of refugees, conducts aptitude tests and cooperates with the resettlement agencies in finding employment opportunities.

Cuban refugees, after registration at the center, are interviewed and classified as to job skills, number of employables in the family, friends, or relatives in the United States, and desired voluntary agency assistance. The processing procedure is as follows:

First. Reception and registration.

Second. Interview and classification.

Third. U.S. Employment Service interview for employable persons.

Fourth. Medical examination and X-ray.

Fifth. Voluntary agency interview for relocation and resettlement.

Sixth. Red Cross—for personal articles distribution.

Seventh. Florida State Welfare Department—for financial assistance, if necessary; also child welfare department, if necessary.

Eighth. Surplus food distribution.

Each refugee receives a medical examination following registration and before being interviewed by representatives of the resettlement agencies. The U.S. Public Health Service, working through the Dade County Public Health Department, provides supervision of the dispensary. In addition to a general health examination, each refugee receives a chest X-ray and inoculations prescribed by the attending physician.

Outpatient care for minor needs is provided by the dispensary. Treatment of serious or chronic conditions is available through an outpatient program. Needs that cannot be met by the dispensary are referred to hospitals of their choice, such as Jackson Memorial, St. Francis, Mercy, Mount Sinai, and Gesu Medical Clinic—an arm of Mercy and St. Francis. A minimal fee is paid by the Center for each visit. Eligibility is restricted to those qualifying for cash assistance grants under the program described on a later page.

The American Red Cross has distributed personal kits to newly arrived refugees since the start of the refugee program.

Certification slips for used clothing issued by the voluntary agencies are redeemable at several church depots in the Miami area. Supplies of clothing have been received from New York and other cities serving as collection centers for clothing drives.

Under Federal auspices, broadscale aid for Cuban refugees in the United States began late in 1960 when, after a review of the situation, President Eisenhower inaugurated a program to deal with the most urgent needs.

Subsequently, President Kennedy recognized the Cuban refugee problem as one of national responsibility and beyond the means and scope of the individual

States or the combined efforts of voluntary agencies. Accordingly, on January 27, 1961, the President issued a formal instruction to the then Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Abraham Ribicoff, saying, in part:

I want you to make concrete my concern and sympathy for those who have been forced from their homes in Cuba and to assure them that we shall seek to expedite their voluntary return as soon as conditions there facilitate that.

After a further personal evaluation of the refugee problem in the Miami area, a comprehensive program was formulated by the HEW Secretary, who assigned the Social Security Commissioner to coordinate the efforts of all Federal agencies affected by the President's directive. In January 1963 the Cuban refugee relief program was placed under the newly constituted Welfare Administration, Dr. Ellen Winston, Commissioner of Welfare. Director of the Cuban refugee program, based in Washington, is John Frederick Thomas.

By Presidential authority, \$5 million had been allocated to the support of cooperative programs relating to the health, education, and welfare of Cuban refugees in the United States, for the period ending June 30, 1961. These funds were part of the money appropriated by Congress to the Mutual Security Contingency Fund and they represent the first expenditure of such funds within the continental borders of the United States.

During the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, the program was carried out with \$38.5 million made available under authorities in the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961. On June 28, 1962, Public Law 87-510—Migration and Refugee Assistance Act of 1962—was enacted which provided a legislative base for assistance to Cuban and other refugees from nations of the Western Hemisphere, and authorized appropriations for such assistance. Funds appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, amounted to \$70,110,000.

Besides the Federal, State, and local agencies, support for the refugees has come from private firms and individuals as well as from educational, religious, cultural, and philanthropic agencies. All their efforts symbolize the President's personal concern and attest to his leadership in promoting the welfare of the refugees.

Through agreements with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Federal funds are being used to administer a wide variety of programs:

Operation of the Cuban Refugee Center and the maintenance of records.

Resettlement of refugee families in communities offering employment opportunities.

A transitional grant to resettling refugees who receive public assistance in Miami at the time of their resettlement—\$100 for a family, \$60 for an individual.

Financial assistance to needy families in the Miami area and to resettled families in other areas.

Consultations and advisory services to voluntary agencies with contractual responsibilities.

Hospitalization and medical care for the sick.

The care and protection of unaccompanied children.

Distribution of surplus food commodities to needy refugees.

Emergency welfare services for American nationals repatriated from Cuba.

Educational loans to needy and deserving Cuban students enrolled in American colleges and universities.

An adult education program, as well as an elementary and secondary education program for refugee children.

The retraining of refugee physicians, attorneys, and other professionals.

The establishment and operation of a Cuban refugee research project.

The Florida State Department of Public Welfare is the principal contract agency for administering immediate relief to the refugees in the form of financial assistance, child welfare services, and in the distribution of surplus food commodities. Professional social workers interview and screen the refugees and certify their eligibility to receive monthly financial assistance checks—a maximum of \$100 per family and \$60 per single case—and inpatient care for acute illness. Child welfare specialists in the Center look after the welfare and education of unaccompanied refugee children.

Through an agreement between the Florida State Department of Public Welfare and the U.S. Department of Agriculture, surplus Federal food commodities are distributed to needy families; this distribution is in addition to other grants-in-aid.

Beside the public and private welfare agencies, aid to the refugees is administered by organizations representing the principal religious faiths of the refugees.

Late in 1959 the Catholic diocese of Miami opened the Centro Hispano Catolico to serve the needs of refugees arriving from Cuba as well as from other Latin American countries. The center's services include medical outpatient care, food, and used clothing distribution, and home visits for the sick.

The Catholic Welfare Bureau of Miami provides a variety of other services to refugees on referral from the Centro Hispano Catolico or from the Catholic relief offices in the center.

The Protestant Latin Refugee Center was established by the Protestant Latin American Emergency Committee to supplement the assistance given through the Federal program.

Jewish refugees from Cuba receive various forms of assistance from the Hebrew Immigrant Aid Society, a national organization.

Hardship cases are helped at eight denominational centers.

Refugees with technical skills and professional training receive special consideration. Lawyers, doctors, and engineers are being retrained to fit them for professional service in the United States; most of the retraining work is carried on with Federal aid by the University of Miami.

Cuban college and university students may receive education grants enabling them to resume their studies in the United States. Applications to university registrars are processed through the Office of Education, an agency of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Mr. Speaker, I have hastily sketched the operations of the Cuban Refugee Center. But even this cursory rundown shows that successful operation under Marshall Wise is solid attestation of his excellent work.

An able administrator, a tireless worker, a dedicated public servant, a great humanitarian, are all words descriptive of Marshall Wise. They bear repeating. His efforts have gained recognition throughout not only the United States and the Western Hemisphere but all of the freedom loving peoples of the world.

I welcome the opportunity to associate myself with the remarks of Mr. Wise which were delivered in his speech to the Downtown Rotary Club of Miami, Fla., on May 2, 1963. In it you will find the heart, courage, and talent of an outstanding public officer who deserves credit and recognition for a job well done. Accordingly, I am privileged to deliver his remarks to you:

A little over 2 years ago—when I first came to this job—people in the community told me we were sitting on a powder keg that might blow up any minute. Eighteen months ago, when I last spoke to this group, I was told the same thing. All during the last 12 months, and once again during the Pepper-Fasell hearings, I heard local labor leaders and other concerned individuals voice the same cry.

However, from where I sit, and from what I see, I've never believed these cries, and right here today I want to say to you, as members of the leading civic organization in this community, that we have not been, and we are not now sitting on a powder keg because of the Cuban refugees living in our midst.

I am really not here to educate you. I bring you information which I hope will enable you to educate yourselves, if that is your desire.

I am not here to plead the special cause of the Cuban refugee, or to defend those who are defenseless. I bring you facts, not fiction, which I hope will enable you to decide whether their cause is a just one, and is deserving of your understanding and active support.

The moment the Cuban crisis erupted recently, Fidel Castro, slammed the door through which thousands of Cubans had been fleeing their land since 1959. Planes which had been flying out more than 6,400 Cubans a month, for 19 months, were ordered to halt operations. An estimated 350,000 Cubans—many of whom had already paid for their passage and were waiting only for plane space—were locked in by the ban on emigration.

To be cut off from freedom—especially when freedom lies only a few tantalizing miles away—is a tragic fact of life affecting millions today in many parts of the globe. The tragedy is heightened when families are split—half in freedom, half behind walls. Many Cuban families, both inside and outside their native land, are suffering the agony which is so widespread in the world today.

I'm not going to repeat all the criticisms and complaints about the refugee influx that you've read in our local newspapers, or heard from your well-meaning neighbors and

June 10

9936

friends, or, may have actually been said by you, yourselves. Most of those I've read or heard, are based on pure fiction and prejudice—not upon hard, cold, facts.

It has been written and said that Cuban refugees are taking jobs away from needy Americans, and lowering the wage rates in Miami and south Florida. I'm sure that some of this has taken place, but the hard cold facts, available to all of you in the reports made by the Florida State Employment Service, the recent special survey on unemployment in Dade County conducted by the U.S. Department of Labor, the First Research Corp., and other professional fact-finding bodies, proves conclusively that these inflammatory statements just can't be proved.

It has been written and said that the influx of Cuban refugees was increasing the crime rate in our communities, yet the official report of the Miami Police Department, released just a few months ago, says that although the crime rate during the past 3 years has increased in Miami—and here I quote from the report—"Cubans were not a problem in the crimes reported on by the department." Lt. Tom Lipe, in making the report, said, "Cubans are good citizens as far as we are concerned."

It has been written and said that the influx of Cuban refugees would ruin south Florida's tourist industry. Yet industry reports show that 1962 was the best tourist year we ever experienced, and right now the tourist industry tells us that 1963 is going to be better than 1962.

It has been written and said that the influx of Cuban refugees would create slums and depress the real estate market. The most recent reports from the Miami Housing Authority, Area Redevelopment officials, the Mortgage Bankers Association, the Real Estate Appraisal Association and the Federal Housing Administration all agree that although there is an overcrowding situation no slums have been created and the real estate market, instead of being depressed, has been greatly helped by the influx of refugees into the area.

It has been written and said that the refugee influx would ruin our school system and slow up the education of our own children. The facts are available to all of you and you can get them by talking to the superintendent of schools, or any of the other responsible officials of the Dade County school system. You'll learn from them that there has been, and still is heavy overcrowding, but that the quality of the Cuban students and the \$9 million of Federal funds that has been given to help with the problem has really improved, rather than hurt, the school system.

And finally, it has been written and said that "they are using all our welfare funds to help the Cubans instead of the needy Americans." The truth is that no Dade County or Florida State funds have ever been used for this purpose. More than \$80 million of purely Federal funds, contributed in taxes by all the people of the United States including you and me, have been used to give these needy refugees asylum, safety and minimum subsistence in the greatest democracy the world has ever known.

The hard, cold facts, and the real truth of the situation, as stated by competent local officials in recent public hearings is that we in Dade County really don't have assistance programs that are worthy of the name. Although Federal funds have been and are now available on a 3-to-1 matching basis for staff, and equal matching basis for general assistance—this means that for every dollar we are willing to appropriate and spend for general assistance the Federal Government will give us \$3 for staff employment and a matching dollar for assistance payments—notwithstanding the fact that such an offer remains open to us we

cannot seem to get our own elected representatives to provide the \$1 that will automatically bring us matching funds to help the needy Americans in our own communities get back on their feet again.

Let's take a quick, short look at some of the plus factors, at some of the good that has resulted in the exodus of the Cuban refugee fleeing from communism, tyranny, and oppression to asylum, safety, and democracy in the Miami area.

1. I contend that the culture of this area has advanced to a point it would have taken another 10 years to reach without this impact.

2. Miami has been striving for many years to establish its right to the title "Gateway to the Americas," and I can't believe that anyone in North, Central, or South America would now attempt to dispute that claim.

3. All of the people of Latin and South America, and islands of the Caribbean are completely aware of the tolerance, hospitality, understanding, and welcome that the citizens of the Miami area have extended to the Cuban refugee.

4. Just think how our schoolteachers, church people, policemen, government agencies, sales people, service trades, civic organizations, hotel people, and many of our citizens have learned to speak Spanish in order to deal with, serve, and host our Spanish-speaking exiles and guests. The progress we've made in this area alone will bring us cultural, as well as economic rewards, for all the remaining years of our lives.

5. Our churches and temples have found a rallying point and popular cause, and have greatly strengthened their ties as a result.

6. All our educational and cultural discussion groups have benefited tremendously by their association with the Cuban exiles, and as a result have learned much, in such a short time, about communism and how it works.

7. We're becoming world famous for our "Operation Amigo" project, and the Cuban refugee provided the bridge of understanding and stimulating spark which advanced the program.

Let's just look at the positive aspects of a few highlights you may not have thought about before:

1. Our public school system, although overburdened and badly crowded now, is being assisted by Federal expenditures to accelerate its rate of growth because of this heavy refugee load. When the refugee impact disappears, as it will in the not too distant future, we'll be just that much further advanced and better able to provide for the future expansion that must come to care for our future normal growth.

2. The success of Interama as a permanent trade fair is a foregone conclusion, because we've proven to all the countries of Latin America that Miami is a host city to the Spanish-speaking world, without a peer to be found anywhere.

3. And last, but by no means least, the tremendous expenditure of Federal funds in this area, more than \$36 million last year, and somewhere in the neighborhood of \$70 million this year, has bolstered Miami's sagging economy during a time which could have been one of depression and retrogression without such a dollar flow.

Miami, an area whose economic bloodstream is fed and nourished by tourist visitors, has always been happy to welcome the "refugee" from the North who is fleeing from the cold weather.

Up to this time, the great majority of Miamians have also welcomed and tolerated the influx of refugees from Cuba, who are basically fleeing from communism and oppression.

However, we are seeing a small minority begin to resent this influx. We are beginning to hear them say, "America for Americans," and, "Miami for Miamians."

Maybe we should remind them that almost everyone in Miami is from somewhere else, and that America has grown great because of its willingness to provide honest opportunities for immigrants and refugees.

Maybe we should remind them that we welcome the Cuban refugee because the bloodstream philosophy of America is inscribed on our Statue of Liberty, a statue which is known to the rest of the world as; "The Mother of Exiles."

Maybe we should rededicate ourselves to these words:

"Give me your tired, your poor,
Your huddled masses yearning to breathe free.
The wretched refuse of your teeming shore.
Send these, the homeless, tempest-tossed to me."

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, on the rollcall vote on Thursday on the bill, H.R. 6754, the agricultural appropriation bill, I was unavoidably absent. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

PAN AMERICAN JET ALL-CARGO CLIPPERS

(Mr. JARMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have spent a very interesting hour and a half this morning at Dulles International Airport inspecting the new Pan American all-cargo jet clipper. My purpose in mentioning this matter to Members of the House is that I consider the process of transporting air freight as developed by Pan American Airlines to be of significant value to the commercial and defense interests of this Nation.

Mr. Speaker, should a cold war crisis erupt somewhere in the world and America's armed might called into action, men and equipment must be moved at jet speed across continents and oceans. At such a time, the Pan American cargo jet would serve as a frontline reserve element in the free world's defenses. For example, Pan Am's jet freighter fleet—representing a private investment of nearly \$60 million—would provide the fastest means of transport for large volume of military cargo to most of the world's critical areas in times of emergency.

Committed to the Civil Reserve Air Fleet, Pan Am's eight freighters on routes between Air Force bases in California and Hawaii could carry nearly 19 million pounds per week of essential military supplies, such as rations, hospital equipment and medicines, military vehicles, and weapon components. Alternately, in all-passenger configurations, they could move 43,780 troops per week on the same routes. In mixed configurations, 109 personnel and nearly 30 tons of freight could be carried on one aircraft.

This important ability to transport quickly men and supplies is due in part to Pan American's palletized preloading system. This system provides a method by which cargo is assembled according to destination, loaded, and secured to